

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/034,415	03/04/1998	PASCAL MICHAUD	1798-7267	3308
75	90 02/26/2003			
FREDERICK F. CALVETTI			EXAMINER	
C/O SMITH, GAMBRELL & RUSSELL 1850 M. STREET, N.W.		CROSS, LATOYA I		
SUITE 800 WASHINGTO	N. DC 20036		ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER	
,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,	.,, 20 2000		1743	

DATE MAILED: 02/26/2003

25

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/034,415	MICHAUD, PASCAL	
Advisory Action	Examiner	Art Unit	
	LaToya I. Cross	1743	
The MAILING DATE of this communication			
		•	
THE REPLY FILED 24 January 2003 FAILS TO PLA Therefore, further action by the applicant is required final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be eithe condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Apexamination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114	to avoid abandonment of this r: (1) a timely filed amendmen opeal (with appeal fee); or (3)	application. A proper reply to it which places the application	a in
PERIOD FOR	R REPLY [check either a) or b)]	
a) A The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing			
 The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of no event, however, will the statutory period for reply ex ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY 706.07(f). 	cpire later than SIX MONTHS from the	e mailing date of the final rejection.	
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the pe fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration da (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See	riod of extension and the correspond te of the shortened statutory period e Office later than three months after	ling amount of the fee. The appropriation reply originally set in the final Office.	ate extension e action; or
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appella 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37			
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered	ed because:		
(a) Ithey raise new issues that would require for	urther consideration and/or se	earch (see NOTE below);	
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see No	ote below);		
(c) they are not deemed to place the applicationissues for appeal; and/or	ion in better form for appeal b	y materially reducing or simpli	fying the
(d) they present additional claims without car	nceling a corresponding numb	per of finally rejected claims.	
NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> .			•
3. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following re	ejection(s):		
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) we canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	ould be allowable if submitted	in a separate, timely filed ame	endment
5.☑ The a)☐ affidavit, b)☐ exhibit, or c)☑ reques application in condition for allowance because		n considered but does NOT pla	ace the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	because it is not directed SO	LELY to issues which were ne	wly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendade explanation of how the new or amended claim			an
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follo	ws:		
Claim(s) allowed: none.			
Claim(s) objected to: none.			
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-4,6-8 and 12-18</u> .			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: none.			
8. The proposed drawing correction filed on	_ is a) □ approved or b) □	disapproved by the Examiner.	
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure State	ement(s)(PTO-1449) Paper N	lo(s)	
	/ /		

Continuation of 2. NOTE: The "water removing" and "2% polyfluorinated alcohol" limitations have not been previously considered..

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicants argue that 2% polyfluorinated alcohol is not taught by Zisman and that Zisman teaches 1% polyfluorinated alcohol in the context of removing organic liquids, not removing water. In response, the Examiner continues to take the position that 2% polyfluorinated alcohol would be obvious over the teaching of using 1% polyfluorinated alcohol in Zisman, particularly since Applicants' own examples 6 and 7 shown at specification page 11 show that there is no significant difference in using 1% versus 2% polyfluorinated alcohol. The water removing results are essentially the same (91% water removal versus 92% water removal). With respect to Applicants' argument that Zisman does not teach an amount of polyfluorinated alcohol for water removal, Applicants' should note that at col. 1, lines 7-11, Zisman teaches that water on surfaces can be removed with the disclosed compositions. Although no specific examples show the amount of polyfluorinated alcohol to be used for water removal, the ordinarily skilled artisan would presume that the same amounts for organic liquid removal can be used for water removal. Further, Applicants' claims are directed to compositions, where patentability is determined by the components of the composition, not the function of the composition.

Juli warden
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Technology Center 1700